

Janice K. Brewer
Governor

Bryan Martyn
Executive Director



Board Members

Walter D. Armer, Jr., Vail, *Chair*
Kay Daggett, Sierra Vista
Alan Everett, Sedona
Larry Landry, Phoenix
William C. Scalzo, Phoenix
Tracey Westerhausen, Phoenix
Vanessa Hickman, State Land Commissioner

**MINUTES
of
THE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE
ADVISORY GROUP
(OHVAG)
of
THE ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD
held**

February 22, 2013 at Pima Motorsports Park, 11800 S. Harrison Rd., Tucson, AZ.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Meeting is called to order at 10:30am.

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

Members Present:

Rebecca Antle (Vice-Chair, OHVAG)
Pete Pfeifer (American Motorcycle Association)
David Moore (Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation)
Thomas McArthur (Coconino Trail Riders)
Bill Nash (Apache County Trail Riders)

Staff Present:

Jeff Prince
Doris Pulsifer
Robert Baldwin
Kent Ennis
Paul Katz

C. ACTION ITEMS

1. Approve Minutes from the August 27, 2012 OHVAG meeting.

Pfeifer makes motion to approve. Moore Seconds. Approved Unanimously.

2. Approve Minutes from the December 5, 2012 OHVAG meeting.

McArthur makes motion to approve. Nash Seconds. Approved Unanimously.

3. Review and Evaluate the January 2013 Statewide OHV Grant Applications.

Antle asks Prince to guide the committee through the grant scoring process.

Prince reminds OHVAG that they are an independent body evaluating the grant. The scoring process is meant to be utilized as a sorting tool to rate the grants; however, as Director Martyn indicated, the committee may develop a narrative to justify any project it believes to warrant funding regardless of its score. A consensus OHVAG scoring recommendation will go directly to the State Parks Board unadulterated by staff or any other committee.

- **First project for scoring and discussion is the Lakeside R.D.,
Maverick Trail maintenance and renovation proposal.**

McArthur asks for clarification on the project. The project consists of 3 miles of trail work and some related signage. The high cost (approximately \$35,000/mile) reflects the difficult malpais terrain and the remote location of the Maverick Trail, Lorna McNeil-Cox explains (telephonically).

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 12pts

C: 0pts

D: 0pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 8pts

B: 8pts

C: 8pts

D: 0pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 5pts

C: 0pts

D: 0pts

Bonus: Priorities 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 (30pts)

Total Consensus Score: 71

- **Arizona Game & Fish, Alamo Wildlife Area**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 0pts

C: 0pts

D: 0pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 8pts
C: 0pts
D: 0pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 0pts
C: 0pts
D: 0pts

Bonus Priorities 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 (35 pts)
Total Consensus Score: 43

• **BLM AZ State Office, Mobile Information Center**

Antle asks applicant if trailer has been in storage and if it has been utilized. Phyllis Ralley answers (telephonically) that it has been in storage and has not been used to date. Nash asks if trailer will be used for both motorized and non-motorized public events. Bill Gibson (BLM) telephonically answers that it will not be used exclusively for OHV-related events.

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 0pts
C: 0pts
D: 0pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 0pts
C: 8pts
D: 8pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 5pts
C: 0pts
D: 0pts

Bonus Priorities 2, 6, 7 (15pts)
Total Consensus Score: 36

• **BLM Kingman Field Office, Travel Management Plan & Route Renovation**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 12pts
C: 12pts
D: 12pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 8pts
C: 8pts
D: 8pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 5pts
C: 5pts
D: 0pts

Bonus Priorities 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 (30pts)
Total Consensus Score: 100

• **BLM Lake Havasu Field Office, Travel Management Plan**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 0pts
C: 0pts
D: 12pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 8pts
C: 8pts
D: 0pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 5pts
C: 5pts
D: 0pts

Bonus Priorities 9 (5pts)

Total Consensus Score: 43

Moore inquires as to why TMP's show up as grant applications when it's a federally-mandated program for the Forest Service. Applicant Amanda Deeds answers (telephonically) that the Forest Service budget has been cut

back and current staff levels are insufficient to do these plans in-house; therefore, grant funding is a viable way to develop the TMP.

• **BLM Tucson Field Office, Middle Gila Project**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 12pts

C: 12pts

D: 0pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 8pts

B: 8pts

C: 8pts

D: 8pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 5pts

C: 5pts

D: 5pts

Bonus Priorities 0 (0pts)

Total Consensus Score: 71

• **BLM Yuma Field Office, Travel Management Plan**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 0pts

C: 0pts

D: 12pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 8pts

C: 8pts

D: 0pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 5pts

C: 5pts

D: 0pts

Bonus Priorities 9 (5pts)
Total Consensus Score: 43

• **Flagstaff R.D., Kelly Motorized Trail Project-Phase I**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 12pts
C: 12pts
D: 12pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 8pts
C: 8pts
D: 0pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 5pts
B: 5pts
C: 5pts
D: 0pts

Bonus Priorities 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 (30pts)
Total Consensus Score: 97

• **Coconino Trail Riders, Kelly Canyon Project Equipment Purchase**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 12pts
C: 12pts
D: 12pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 0pts
C: 8pts
D: 8pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 5pts
B: 5pts

C: 5pts
D: 0pts

Bonus Priorities 4, 5, 6, 7 (20pts)
Total Consensus Score: 87

• **Florence Police Department, UTV Purchase**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 0pts
C: 0pts
D: 0pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 8pts
B: 0pts
C: 0pts
D: 8pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 5pts
C: 5pts
D: 0pts

Bonus Priorities 1, 2, 5 (15pts)
Total Consensus Score: 41

• **Maricopa County Sheriff, UTV Purchase**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 0pts
C: 0pts
D: 0pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 8pts
B: 0pts
C: 0pts
D: 0pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 0pts
C: 5pts
D: 0pts

Bonus Priorities 2, 4, 5, 7 (20pts)
Total Consensus Score: 33

• **Mohave County, Hualapai Mountain Park Improvements**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 12pts
C: 12pts
D: 0pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 8pts
C: 0pts
D: 0pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 5pts
B: 5pts
C: 0pts
D: 5pts

Bonus Priorities 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9 (30pts)
Total Consensus Score: 77

• **Tonto N.F., OHV Volunteer Project Expansion**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts
B: 12pts
C: 12pts
D: 12pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 8pts
B: 8pts
C: 8pts
D: 8pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 5pts

C: 5pts

D: 0pts

Bonus Priorities 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 (40pts)

Total Consensus Score: 118

- **Cave Creek R.D, Tonto N.F., Pipe Rail Fencing**

Consensus Scoring:

1st Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 0pts

C: 12pts

D: 0pts

2nd Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 0pts

C: 0pts

D: 0pts

3rd Level Priority

A: 0pts

B: 5pts

C: 0pts

D: 0pts

Bonus Priorities 3 (5pts)

Total Consensus Score: 22

4. **OHVAG Will Develop a Recommendation for Funding the January 2013 OHV Grant Applications.**

- **Cave Creek Ranger District:** No further OHVAG discussion. OHVAG recommends not funding the grant request at this time.
- **Maricopa County Sheriff:** Antle sees benefit of funding such projects; however, funding request amount seems relatively high for the scope of the project. Moore believes funding for this type of equipment purchase should be an internal agency budget matter and OHV grant funding should not be utilized. Pfeifer and Nash note the benefit and need for more "search and rescue" resources but believe law enforcement agencies should secure separate funding.

OHVAG recommends not funding the grant request at this time. Prince encourages applicants whose grants were not recommended for funding this cycle to contact State Parks staff for assistance to improve application for the next grant cycle.

- **BLM Arizona State Office:** Antle states there should be a match of funds contributed from the non-motorized grant funding side due to the ambiguous, educational nature of the proposal, which is not OHV-specific. Nash concurs with Antle. McArthur agrees that the project has virtually nothing to do with OHV and it appears to serve primarily as a BLM promotional tool.

OHVAG recommends not funding the grant request at this time.

- **Florence Police Department:** Nash notes there is no specific information provided on the educational component mentioned in the application other than an “education day”. Again, Moore states his belief that law enforcement equipment purchases should be an internal budget item. He also asks about the operational time of the proposed UTV, since there was little information provided on funding an OHV officer. Prince reminds the committee that law enforcement is a valid priority component of grant evaluation. Also, he states that State Parks is committed to encouraging rural and remote development as part of its mission. Many small towns do not have the means or knowledge to plug into the larger OHV grant/coordinated volunteer system.

OHVAG recommends not funding the grant request at this time.

- **BLM Yuma Field Office:** Moore wants to ensure the funding amount requested for the travel management plan is appropriate. McArthur states he is against funding for the project and believes these types of mandated plans should be an internal agency operations budget matter, not an OHV grant-funded project. Also, McArthur submits that TMP’s may not be beneficial to the OHV community and asks if anyone has seen a completed TMP that benefits OHV. Nash answers that certain areas, such as Bartlett Lake in the Tonto N.F. improved OHV trails by closing certain trails but improving other trails through their TMP. McArthur indicates he’s glad to hear of successful TMP outcomes but he still believes it’s an internal agency budget matter. Nash replies that federal budget cuts will restrict useful management tools such as TMP’s and could limit future trail opportunities since it’s easier to close trails down, rather than invest in multiple routing evaluation and designation. Baldwin explains the

adjusted sign cost, similarly applied to the BLM Lake Havasu application, brings a staff recommended funding amount of \$113,800.

OHVAG recommends amended funding amount of \$113,800.

- **BLM Lake Havasu Field Office:** Moore indicates the same concerns some may have with the BLM Yuma travel management plan proposal exist with this project as well. OHVAG requests staff input on recommendation. Baldwin notes that adjustments were needed in proposal for trail crew hourly wage rates. Minor changes include \$19/hr. for trail crew wages, whereas, mandated grant labor rates are \$18/hr. He also explains some concern over per sign rates of \$74. Staff researched similar sign costs and found a cost of \$50 per sign to be sufficient. Therefore, staff recommended funding \$72,100 for the project.

OHVAG recommends amended funding amount of \$72,100.

- **Lakeside Ranger District:** Antle notes the high cost per mile for the project. Pfeifer agrees the cost per mile of the project is high but the remote location contributes to the higher costs.

OHVAG recommends full funding for the project.

- **AZ Game & Fish (Alamo WLA):** OHVAG asks for staff input on the project. Prince states that staff recommended funding for the signage project.

OHVAG recommends full funding for the project.

- **BLM Tucson Field Office:** McArthur noted some good points to the proposal, but some reductions in funding should take place. Nash indicated the caretaker's salary shouldn't be included in grant funding for the project. Antle inquires as to why the Ambassador Program can't handle the outreach event, as proposed. Prince clarifies that the Middle Gila and the Ambassador's have a long-standing relationship, though this particular outreach event is meant to be a unveiling of the new trails in the area and a land-managers' fair-type of event. OHVAG requests information regarding what staff recommends for project funding amounts. Prince indicates the original request was \$233,400 but staff recommended \$97,000. Included in the recommended funding deduction were the caretaker's salary and other line items. OHVAG concurs with staff funding recommendation.

OHVAG recommends amended funding amount of \$97,000.

- **BLM Kingman Field Office:** McArthur re-states his hesitation to fund TMP's but he indicates this project is proposing some route maintenance in addition to the TMP funding request.

OHVAG recommends full funding for the project.

- **Coconino Trail Riders:** OHVAG requests staff input on grant application. Prince replies that staff recommended partial funding for the project. Nash recommends that State Parks purchase equipment for trail group use, instead of individual groups purchasing such equipment. Group use of trail equipment would be a more efficient use of funding, he states. Antle voices concerns about funding the "volunteer nutrition" portion of the grant request. Prince explains that staff recommended the feeding of project volunteers due to the exceptional return on investment, high amount of energy expended by trail crews, and the fact that governmental entities can't purchase food for volunteers while private trail groups are able to. Nash and Moore voice concerns about the proposed purchase of KTM's for the project. While Rokons have usefulness as tool haulers, KTM's are essentially for personal transportation. Nash restates the benefit of State Parks purchasing and loaning out trail-building equipment, instead of one group purchasing and utilizing equipment on a limited basis. Pfeifer concurs with Nash. Prince indicates an equipment loan-out program through State Parks is in the planning stages and would be an efficient use of OHV funds. Baldwin explains staff recommended funding for chainsaws, PPE, gas cans, trash bags, and volunteer nutrition for a total of \$12,585.

OHVAG recommends amended funding amount of \$12,585.

- **Mohave County:** McArthur describes elements of the project. The tot lot is really just an unimproved parking lot and it needs to be turned into a real practice area for children, he says. Also, he describes the access road to the tot lot as in nearly impassible condition. Moore notes that some of the cost estimates seemed unrealistic, particularly since figures are well-rounded and little written estimate support is offered. OHVAG requests input from staff's recommendation. Prince states that staff doesn't recommend funding but is willing to work with applicant on a future grant application. Prince asks OHVAG for suggestions they would like forwarded onto applicant for future reference. Members suggest better, more detailed written cost estimates and bids. Also, Antle recommends a barrier to protect tot lot area from public road. Baldwin reminds OHVAG that the project focuses on access roads to and from the trail and those routes

aren't technically considered OHV trails. This is why staff issued the project a low score relative to other projects, he explains.

OHVAG recommends not funding the grant request at this time.

- **Flagstaff R.D., Coconino N.F.** OHVAG recommends full funding for the project.
- **Tonto N.F.:** OHVAG requests input of staff recommendation for project. Prince indicates staff decided not to score the project, although it was likely to earn a high score. Staff decided not to score due to the lack of measurable elements in the application. Prince says the application broadly described performing road maintenance but it did not specify location of work. Doris Pulsifer describes AORCC's recommendation on the project. She notes that AORCC agreed with staff's concerns that no specific plans were detailed in the application and staff will need to work with applicants to reapply in the future. Baldwin reminds OHVAG that this project proposes hiring an employee for 3 years, the type of project component the group traditionally likes to avoid funding. Also, he explains the project was not scored by staff due to its incompleteness. The grant application manual clearly states that specific worksite location descriptions are required for project proposals, Baldwin notes.

OHVAG recommends not funding the grant request at this time.

Prince indicates the only difference between OHVAG funding recommendations and AORCC recommendations is that AORCC recommended funding for the BLM AZ State Office Mobile Information Center while OHVAG did not. Both AORCC and OHVAG funding recommendations will go the Parks Board for consideration and final approval.

Antle asks what the total amount for OHVAG recommended project funding is. Baldwin states the total is \$778,563. Prince reminds the board of the overall uniformity of the scoring and recommendation process. Both staff and OHVAG came up with the same project funding recommendations.

Antle moves to approve \$778,563 in funding from the OHV-RTP or OHV Recreation Fund, based on staff recommendations for the following projects: BLM Kingman F.O., Coconino N.F., Coconino Trail Riders, Lakeside R.D., BLM Lake Havasu F.O., BLM Tucson F.O., AZ Game & Fish, BLM Yuma and suggests they be forwarded to the Parks Board. Pfeifer seconds. Approved Unanimously.

5. Discuss the Motorized Grant Application Evaluation Tool and Consider Changes

Moore acknowledges possible correlation between projects that score high and relatively high requested funding amounts. However, he notes that many times the low scoring projects that don't request high amounts of funding are needed and highly valuable to the OHV community. For example, the Game & Fish grant application requesting merely \$3,000 for signage at Alamo Lake is a needed project that didn't score well. Antle agrees and notes that the way the evaluation tool is formatted, projects such as the Alamo signage project don't score well.

Moore recommends an abbreviated form for OHV grant applications with a cap amount in order to expedite smaller projects beneficial to OHV. OHVAG inquires about a past grant process similar to the abbreviated form being discussed. Baldwin notes that reductions in state funding led to staff cuts over the past few years, eliminating grant funding process changes. He also reminds OHVAG that a system which would see larger numbers of small funding projects add up to significant staff and committee review time, thus defeating the purpose of an expedited system.

Prince indicates that staff can do further research on possible changes to the grant application process. Also, he notes that staff is reviewing the possibility of funding separate entities, such as law enforcement, to help meet the needs of various sectors of the OHV community.

Moore doesn't agree with the "all or nothing" approach to scoring in particular categories. He believes evaluators should have the flexibility to give partial points to applications addressing portions of a priority element. Staff explains the current tool was developed and approved to reduce subjectivity and create a more straightforward approach to grant evaluation. Baldwin states the process will evolve as more grant cycles occur more frequently. He also explains some better definitions may be needed, for example, what constitutes an "educational program"?

Antle believes OHV user-groups' letters of support should account for bonus points in grant applications. Pulsifer explains the Parks Board approved the current criteria of looking to outside support for granting bonus points to grant applications. The Parks Board's goal in the bonus point requirement was to gain and reward wider public support for OHV. OHVAG requests State Parks Board to revise the Priority #4 of the Bonus Scoring Criteria in the 2013 OHV Grant Manual.

6. Consider Reallocating Funds for Coconino NF-Red Rock RD Stoneman Lake/Apache Maid OHV Area Improvements #551201/471201

McArthur makes motion to reallocate funds, as recommended by staff. Nash Seconds. Approved Unanimously.

D. REPORTS – Group and staff reports may be written or verbal.

1. Parks Board Actions on OHVAG Items

Prince reports that at their December 4, 2012 meeting the Parks Board approved funding for the International Trails Symposium.

2. Staff Report on OHV Recreation Fund Revenue

Prince instructs any OHVAG member that has questions regarding OHV funds to contact him and he can provide information.

3. Staff Report on recent OHV Program accomplishments

Prince informs the committee of his endeavors on facilitating and growing partnerships through reaching out to OHV groups and land managers throughout the state to promote OHV.

E. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No response.

F. CALL FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Ambassador Program update and discussion.
Status of work trailer and past grant projects.

G. TIME AND PLACE OF 2013 OHVAG MEETINGS

April 26 – 10am, Joint Meeting with the Arizona State Committee On Trail (ASCOT) for certification of 2014 Recreational Trails Program funding.
April 26 – 1pm, site TBD.

H. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting is adjourned at 5:16 PM